



**AGENDA
CITY OF BRYAN
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Wednesday, 10 August 2005**

**Regular Meeting – 5:30 p.m.
Council Chambers of the Municipal Building, 300 S. Texas Avenue**

1. Call to Order
2. Recognition of Visitors
3. Citizens to Be Heard on Items Not on Agenda
4. Recognition of Affidavits for Conflict of Interest
5. Consideration of Minutes — July 27, 2005
6. Public Hearing and Consideration for **506 South Haswell**
Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations
7. Public Hearing and Consideration for **200 South Main**
Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations
8. Commissioner and Staff Concerns
 - A. Individual Commissioners' Concerns
 - B. Items for Upcoming Agendas
9. Adjournment

08/10/2005
STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF BRAZOS
CITY OF BRYAN

On the 10th day of August 2005, the Historic Landmark Commission of the City of Bryan convened in an open session of their regular meeting in the City Council Chambers of the Bryan Municipal Building at 5:30 p.m. with the following in attendance:

Commission Member	Attended Today	Mtgs. Held Since Apptmt.	Mtgs. Att'd. Since Apptmt.	% Mtgs Attended	Mtgs Held Last 6 Mths	Mtgs Att'd Last 6 Mths	% Attended Last 6 Mths
Dawn Jourdan	Yes	8	8	100%	*	*	*
James Ferguson	Yes	8	8	100%	*	*	*
Jim Hiney	Yes	31	28	90%	8	5	63%
Chad Grauke	Yes	8	7	88%	*	*	*
George Hester	Yes	19	17	89%	8	7	88%
James Crawley	Yes	8	7	88%	*	*	*
Sheila Fields	Yes	8	7	88%	*	*	*

Staff members present: Katie Blanchard, Downtown Project Planner; Samuel Aguirre, Assistant City Attorney; Stephan Gage, Planning Intern.

1. Call To Order

Chairperson Hester called the meeting to order at 5:34 PM.

2. Recognition Of Visitors

There were two (2) visitors:

1. Michael Schaefer, of 17912 Indian Lakes Drive, College Station, Texas; and,
2. Robert Nelson, of 2505 Oak Circle, Bryan, Texas.

3. Citizens To Be Heard

There were none.

4. Recognition Of Affidavits Filed In Response To State Law On Disclosure Of Local Official's Conflict Of Interest

There were none.

5. Consideration Of Minutes

Approval of minutes from July 27, 2005.

Commissioner Fields asked that her name be corrected under Item #5, Consideration of Minutes, on page 1 of 6.

Commissioner Jourdan made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected, and Commissioner Ferguson seconded the motion.

The motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

6. Public Hearing/Consideration – Certificate of Appropriateness for 506 South Haswell

Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations

Katie Blanchard, Downtown Project Planner, presented the staff report (on file in Planning Services). Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission that the applicant is proposing the following alterations:

1. Construction of a 6-ft. tall painted wooden privacy fence (referred to on drawings as “permanent fence”) along the rear property line and portions of the side property lines, from a point parallel to the front façade and behind; and
2. Construction of a 6-ft. tall wooden privacy fence (referred to on drawings as “temporary fence”) and gate along portions of the side property lines. The temporary fence will be removed and replaced with the permanent fence design once the main house remodel is completed.

Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission that the proposal meets the construction, material, and placement standards of the Historic Preservation Ordinance and that staff recommends approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

The Commission discussed the following with staff:

1. Has remodeling of the home on the property already begun; and,

Staff responded that main structure is located at Haswell and 30th Street and the applicant owns both properties.

2. Will the proposed “temporary fence” be similar in design to a wooden fence across the street from the subject site; and,

Staff responded that the “temporary fence” meets the standards for fences in the Historic District, being a typical 6 feet wood privacy fence, and the “permanent fence” is slightly more embellished.

3. Does the ornamentation on the proposed “permanent fence” cause said fence to exceed the height requirements of the Historic Preservation Ordinance; and,

Staff responded that the wood finials on the proposed “permanent fence” do not cause the fence to exceed the height requirements of the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

4. Which property is being renovated; and,

Staff responded that the main structure located at 712 East 30th Street is the one being renovated.

5. Is it typical for owners to install two fences; and,

Staff responded that it is not typical for owners to build two fences.

The public hearing was opened.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Grauke made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for 506 South Haswell Street, and Commissioner Fields seconded the motion.

The Commission discussed the following:

1. Should a one-year time limit be placed on the “temporary fence”; and,
2. The applicant seem to be making a good faith effort on the project and a one-year

- time limit may be too restrictive; and,
3. The "temporary fence" can not be seen from the street and meets the standards for the Historic District; therefore a time limit is not necessary.

The motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

7. Public Hearing/Consideration – Certificate of Appropriateness for 200 South Main
Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations

Katie Blanchard, Downtown Project Planner, presented the staff report (on file in Planning Services). Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission that the applicant is in the process of redeveloping the Howell Building, located at 200 South Main Street, and is proposing the following exterior alterations:

1. Installation of an exterior fire escape door on the third floor of the north façade;
2. Installation of a projecting sign over the main entrance on the east (South Main Street) façade;
3. Installation of a new wood and glass front entry door on the east (South Main Street) façade.

Ms. Blanchard informed the Commission of the following:

1. The third floor fire escape door will be installed in a window opening which was converted into a door opening in order to comply with current building codes; and,
2. Conversion of the window opening was approved by the Commission on February 23, 2005; and,
3. The proposed door will be similar in style and material to other exterior doors on the building except it will have an arched top to match the opening; and,
4. The door will have glass panels similar in style to other exterior doors in the building; and,
5. The door will have the appropriate panic hardware installed as required by the building code.
6. The proposed projecting sign is approximately 4 feet wide by 3 feet high (12 sq. ft.), and when installed will project from the building approximately 55 inches; and,
7. The sign is constructed of sheet metal in an angle iron frame with adhesive vinyl letters; and,
8. The sign will not be illuminated and will be installed above the main entrance to Doe's restaurant on the east façade of the building on Main Street; and,
9. The proposed front entrance door was specifically requested by the tenant, Doe's Eat Place, and has already been installed and the custom wood and glass door is over 36" wide features the Doe's Eat Place logos, while the glass sidelights feature Texas A&M logos; and,
10. Staff finds that the proposed fire escape door is similar in to other exterior doors that have been either repaired or replaced in the building and that both the material and design of the proposed escape door is appropriate, and recommends approval; and,
11. Staff finds that the proposed projecting sign meets all the material, and placement requirements of the Historic Preservation Ordinance and the Sign Ordinance; and,
12. Though the Sign Ordinance does not give specific parameters for the size of projecting signage in Downtown, staff contends that the proposed size of the sign is appropriate; and,
13. Staff contends that the sign is a reversible addition to the building, and recommends approval; and,
14. Staff finds that the proposed new front entry door meets the material standards of the Historic Preservation Ordinance; and,
15. Staff contends that the proposed entry door is an acceptable addition to the building, as the original opening in the storefront has not been altered and the door

could easily be reversed by future tenants.

The Commission discuss the following with staff:

1. When was the front entry door installed; and,

Staff responded that the door was installed prior to the last Commission meeting (July 27, 2005).

2. Has the proposed sign also been installed; and,

Staff responded that the sign was installed only to show the desired installation location and was immediately removed.

3. Is the front entry door ADA compliant; and,

Staff responded that the door has been approved by the City Building Inspectors, and that ADA compliance will be met by the entry on the north side of the building.

The public hearing was opened.

Michael Schaefer, of 17912 Indian Lakes Drive, College Station, Texas, informed the Commission that he was responsible for not ensuring that the front entry door was approved by the Commission prior to its installation.

The Commission discussed the following with Mr. Schaefer:

1. Did the building inspectors approve the door as ADA compliant at the time of installation; and,

Mr. Schaefer responded that the door meets all ADA requirements and the door was installed prior to Commission approval due to miscommunication with staff.

2. Will the applicant submit additional requests in the future for material or appliances which have already been installed; and,

Mr. Schaefer responded that there were no other items that would need to be brought before the Commission.

3. Are there any plans to install an awning along the front of the building; and,

Mr. Schaefer responded that there are no plans for an awning.

4. What is the front entry door made of; and,

Mr. Schaefer responded that the front entry door was made of mahogany wood.

5. Will the fire escape door be arched or have an arched transom above it; and,

Mr. Schaefer responded that the fire escape door itself would have an arched top.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Fields made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for 200 South Main Street, and Commissioner Jourdan seconded the motion.

The motion was passed with a unanimous vote.

8. Commissioner And Staff Concerns

A. Individual Commissioner's Concerns

Commissioner Grauke commented that the responsibility of the Commission was to review anything that would change the exterior appearance of buildings in the Historic District, yet it seems many buildings are completely or partially demolished without the Commission's consent. How can the Commission stay abreast of these changes?

Staff responded that demolition work for the Howell building was submitted and approved prior to Commissioner Grauke's tenure on the Commission, and that demolition work in general is submitted for review and approval by the Commission.

Commissioner Jourdan reported that her neighbors in the Heritage Park District have expressed an interest in any tax incentives the City of Bryan could offer to spur historic preservation throughout the city.

B. Items for Upcoming Agendas

Staff reported that there were no upcoming agenda items; however there have been numerous calls about the expanded boundaries of the Downtown Improvement Program, which could spur additional COA requests.

9. Adjournment

Commissioner Hiney made the motion to adjourn, and the motion was seconded by Commissioner Grauke.

There being no other business, the August 10th Regular Meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission adjourned at 6:12 PM.

THESE MINUTES SHALL SERVE AS THE OFFICIAL FINDINGS OF THE HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION, AS APPROVED THIS 14th DAY OF September, 2005.

Signature of File

Chairperson of the Historic Landmark Commission